

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5 to 7 and 19 to 22, 24, 26, 28 and 30 are pending in this application of which claims 1 and 19 are the independent claims. Independent claim 1 is amended to include the features of cancelled claim 7. Independent claim 19 is amended to include the cancelled features of claim 21. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 3, 5 to 7, 24 and 31 to 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Barber (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20040101680) in view of Schwartz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,826,508 hereinafter "Schwartz"). Claim 19 to 22, 24 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Barber in view of Schwartz and Fitzer et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,227,359 hereinafter "Fitzer")

Amended claim 1 is directed to a fabric product. The fabric product includes a fabric layer having a plurality of high strength and high modulus fibers. The plurality of fibers is impregnated by an impregnation compound with the fabric layer coated on each side with the impregnation compound. The impregnation compound is derived from a mixture including a pre-polymer, a co-reactant curative and a diluent. The diluent solvates the mixture of the pre-polymer and the curative. The impregnation compound has a curative stoichiometry range of less than 85 percent. The high strength and high modulus fibers comprise at least one of aramid fibers or aromatic polyester fibers. The ratio of the curative to the pre-polymer is derived from the formula $\frac{6.34 \times 0.75 \times 230}{42}$ = parts by weight of curative per 100 parts of pre-polymer, where

the pre-polymer comprises an isocyanate and where 6.34 is the isocyanate content of the pre-polymer, 0.75 is the desired stoichiometry of the mixture, 230 is the equivalent weight of the curative and 42 is the equivalent weight of the isocyanate.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1. In particular, the cited prior art does not disclose or suggest that the ratio of the curative to the pre-polymer is derived from the formula $\frac{6.34 \times 0.75 \times 230}{42}$ = parts by weight of curative per 100 parts of pre-polymer, where the pre-polymer comprises an isocyanate and where 6.34 is the isocyanate content of the pre-polymer, 0.75 is the desired stoichiometry of the mixture, 230 is the equivalent weight of the curative and 42 is the equivalent weight of the isocyanate.

As understood by Applicants Barber does not specify that the equivalent weight of the curative is 230, that the 6.34 is the isocyanate content of the pre-polymer, that the 42 is the equivalent weight of the isocyanate or that the ratio of the curative to the pre-polymer is 26.1 parts by weight of curative per 100 parts of pre-polymer. Furthermore, the Examiner has not shown these claim elements in Barber. Moreover, the Examiner has not clearly identified to Applicants what relationship he is inferring with the term "cross-linked polymer" found in Barber and the recited claim. Even if the Examiner's terms have some correlation to the recited claim, the Examiner has only indicated three variables of the ratio by showing the .75 to 1.25 stoichiometry range, the 5 to 90 percent pre-polymer range and the .001 to 40 weight percent cross-linked parameter. Applicants submit that there are five variables in the ratio equation that should be identified in Barber so that Applicants can reasonably respond. For Example, the Examiner has indicated that a remaining weight percentage of the applied composition may be the curative (see

page 3 of the Office Action). Applicants submit that this is a conclusory statement not supported by facts using no more than hindsight. Applicants request the Examiner support his rationale with logic and supported facts. Therefore, Applicants submit that a *prima facie* case has not been shown because the Examiner has not shown all of the recited elements in claim 1 in the prior.

Moreover, Applicants have recited a specific ratio not shown in the prior art. Applicants submit that this ratio required undue experimentation. Whether separately or in combination, none of the cited prior art references disclose or suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art that the ratio of the curative to the pre-polymer is derived from the formula $\frac{6.34 \times 0.75 \times 230}{42}$ = parts by weight of curative per 100 parts of pre-polymer, where the pre-polymer comprises an isocyanate and where 6.34 is the isocyanate content of the pre-polymer, 0.75 is the desired stoichiometry of the mixture, 230 is the equivalent weight of the curative and 42 is the equivalent weight of the isocyanate.

Claim 19 has corresponding features to claim 1. Applicants submit the Barber reference should also be withdrawn with respect to claim 19 for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Applicants submit that all dependent claims now depend on allowable independent claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the art rejection.

Applicants submit that all dependent claims now depend on allowable independent claims.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for withdrawing the prior art cited with regards to any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicants submit that the entire application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

All correspondence should be directed to the address below. Applicants' attorney can be reached by telephone at (781) 401-9988 ext. 123.

Applicants : Sharon A. Elsworth, et al.
Serial No. : 10/773,125
Filed : February 5, 2004
Page : 11 of 11


Attorney's Docket No.: RTN-194AUS

Enclosed is an electronic fee for a One-Month Extension of Time. No other fee is believed to be due for this Response; however, if any fees are due, please apply such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0845 referencing Attorney Docket: RTN-194AUS.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

29 October 2007



Anthony T. Mooney
Reg. No. 55,773

Daly, Crowley, Mofford & Durkee, LLP
354A Turnpike Street - Suite 301A
Canton, MA 02021-2714
Telephone: (781) 401-9988 ext. 123
Facsimile: (781) 401-9966